arXiv:1207.1030v1 [math.DG] 4 Jul 2012

Lightlike hypersurfaces in Lorentzian manifolds

Manuel Gutiérrez[1]* and Benjamín Olea[2]
Departamento de Álgebra, Geometría y Topología
Universidad de Málaga. Spain.
[1]`mgl@agt.cie.uma.es`, [2]`benji@agt.cie.uma.es`

July 5, 2012

Abstract

Given a lightlike hypersurface L in a Lorentzian manifold and ζ a vector field which is not tangent to it, we construct a lightlike section, a screen distribution and a Riemannian metric $\widetilde{g}$ on L. We study the relationship between the ambient Lorentzian manifold and the Riemannian manifold $(L, \widetilde{g})$ under some suitable hypothesis on ζ, which allows us to prove some results about L using the Riemannian character of $\widetilde{g}$. We particularize to the case of generalized Robertson-Walker spaces.

2000 Mathematical Subject Classification: 53C50; 53C80; 53B30.
Keywords and phrases: lightlike hypersurface, lightcone, rigging, rigged vector field, generalized Robertson-Walker space.

1 Introduction

Lightlike hypersurfaces are exclusive objects from Lorentzian manifolds, in the sense that they have not Riemannian counterpart, so they are interesting by their own from a geometric point of view. Moreover, they play an important role in relativity theory because they represent light fronts, in particular event horizons, that are used in the description of the laws of black hole mechanics. It is believed that quantum gravitional effects are relevant inside them, so they are key objects for modern physics, [10].

The degeneracy of the induced metric makes impossible to study them as part of standard submanifold theory, forcing to develop specific techniques. The usual tool to study a lightlike hypersurface L is to fix on it a geometric data formed by a lightlike section and a screen distribution. This allows to define an induced connection, which does not arise necessarily from a metric, and the second fundamental form, which gives the expected information on the extrinsic geometry of L. But the induced connection is not an appropriate tool to study the intrinsic properties of L by obvious reasons. Both the lightlike section and the screen distribution are fixed arbitrarily and independently, so all geometric objects derived from them depend on these choices. A remarkable exception is the second fundamental form, which does not depend on the screen distribution

---

*This paper was supported in part by MEYC-FEDER Grant MTM2010-18089.

but its precise value does depend on the lightlike section. However, the qualitative facts of being proportional to the metric or being zero, which correspond to totally umbilic or totally geodesic hypersurfaces, are also independent of the chosen lightlike section. There are additional difficulties since it is not clear how to choose them in order to have a reasonable coupling between the properties of L and M, specially in the presence of symmetries. Despite these difficulties, there are remarkable success, specially in relativity theory, [2, 3, 10], and some papers deal with the construction of canonical screen distributions, which could overcome the above mentioned dependence, [6].

The motivation of this paper is to introduce a Riemannian structure instead of a linear connection on a lightlike hypersurface. The fact that the auxiliary structure is Riemannian and that it fixes a lightlike section and a screen distribution in a natural way, makes us believe that it is an appropriate tool to study lightlike hypersurfaces both intrinsically and extrinsically. So we think that it is an extension of the previous techniques with improved properties. As a result, much of well known facts in the theory admit an easy interpretation. For example, the Null Splitting Theorem introduced by Galloway in [9] was presented as a lightlike version of the Lorentzian Splitting Theorem, where the "splitting" takes place in a lightlike hypersurface L in certain sense. The splitting interpretation is clear now because, with our Riemannian metric, $(L, \widetilde{g})$ locally becomes a direct product $\mathbb{R} \times S$, see Theorem 25 and Remark 26.

The construction of the Riemannian structure on a lightlike hypersurface L is made in Section 3. It depends on the choice of a vector field ζ (called rigging) on an open neighborhood of L in a way such that the lightlike section ξ (called the rigged of ζ), the screen distribution and the Riemannian metric $\widetilde{g}$ that it fixes on L are reasonably coupled with the ambient geometry. Indeed, the coupling degree is related with the geometric properties of the chosen rigging. For example, in general, L is totally geodesic if and only ξ is $\widetilde{g}$-orthogonally Killing (Remark 9), but if ζ is closed, then L is totally geodesic if and only if ξ is $\widetilde{g}$-parallel, (Corollary 23). These kind of relations allow us to obtain new information on the properties of L as a lightlike hypersurface. Theorem 17 uses the Bochner technique to show a curvature condition which implies that a compact umbilic lightlike hypersurface must be totally geodesic. On the other hand, if the rigging is conformal, then the rigged vector field is geodesic respect to g, Lemma 11. This is used in Corollary 20 to study closed lightlike hypersurfaces.

Besides the family of event horizons, that has been extensively studied in physics, future and past lightcones are the most natural examples of lightlike hypersurfaces. As we can expect, lightcones at any point can not be totally geodesic, Proposition 28. We wonder when they are totally umbilic and we obtain a positive answer in Robertson-Walker spaces, Proposition 35. In Theorem 36 we show that in a generalized Robertson-Walker space, conjugate points along a lightlike geodesic in totally umbilic lightcone, have maximum multiplicity, which could be relevant in Cosmology. In Theorem 39 we show that if a generalized Robertson-Walker space $I \times_f F$ admits a totally umbilic lightlike hypersurfaces, then F splits locally as a twisted product, so in this family there are examples without totally umbilic lightlike hypersurfaces. Moreover, in spaces of constant curvature with dimension greater than 3, lightcones are the unique proper totally umbilic lightlike hypersurfaces. This last result was known in principle in the literature [1], but we believe there is a gap in their argument, so we give an alternative proof, Theorem 46. We also show in Theorem 43 that totally umbilic lightlike hypersurface in a Robertson-Walker space $I \times_f \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, with $n > 3$ and $\int_I \frac{1}{f} > \pi$, are lightcones. In particular, this result can be applied to the closed Friedmann Cosmological space.

2 Geometry of lightlike hypersurfaces

In this section we review some facts about lightlike hypersurfaces to fix notations (see [5] for details).

Given (M, g) a n-dimensional time-orientable Lorentzian manifold and L a lightlike hypersurface, we can choose a lightlike vector field $\xi \in \mathfrak{X}(L)$. A *screen distribution* SL is a complementary distribution in TL to ξ and the *transverse distribution* is the unique lightlike one-dimensional distribution orthogonal to SL not contained in TL. Being M time-orientable, there is a lightlike vector field N over L which generates the transverse distribution and it can be normalized so that $g(N, \xi) = 1$.

We usually denote by U, V, W vector fields in L and X, Y, Z vector fields in SL. If $U, V \in \mathfrak{X}(L)$, the vector fields $\nabla_U V$ and $\nabla_U N$ can be decomposed in the following way.

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_U V &= \nabla^L_U V + B(U,V)N, \\ \nabla_U N &= \tau(U)N - A(U), \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $\nabla^L_U V, A(U) \in TL$ and τ is a one form. The operator ∇^L is a symmetric connection that satisfies

$$\left(\nabla^L_U g\right)(V, W) = B(U,V)g(N,W) + B(U,W)g(N,V), \tag{2}$$

A is the *shape operator* of L and B is a symmetric tensor, called the *second fundamental form* of L, that satisfies $B(U,V) = -g(\nabla_U \xi, V)$. Moreover, $B(\xi, \cdot) = 0$ and ξ is a pregeodesic vector field, in fact $\nabla_\xi \xi = -\tau(\xi)\xi$.

The notion of totally geodesic or umbilic hypersurface also has sense in the degenerate case. Indeed, L is *totally geodesic* if $B \equiv 0$ and totally umbilic if $B = \rho g$ for certain $\rho \in C^\infty(L)$.

Given $U \in \mathfrak{X}(L)$, the vector field $\nabla_U \xi$ belongs to L, so it can be decomposed as

$$\nabla_U \xi = -\tau(U)\xi - A^*(U),$$

where $A^*(U) \in SL$. The endomorphism A^* is called the *shape operator* of SL and it satisfies $B(U,V) = g(A^*(U), V)$ and

$$B(A^*(U), V) = B(U, A^*(V)). \tag{3}$$

The trace of A^* is the *lightlike mean curvature* of L, explicitly given by

$$H_p = \sum_{i=3}^{n} g(A^*(e_i), e_i) = \sum_{i=3}^{n} B(e_i, e_i),$$

being $\{e_3, \ldots, e_n\}$ an orthonormal basis of SL_p.

On the other hand, given $U \in \mathfrak{X}(L)$ and $X \in SL$, we decompose

$$\nabla^L_U X = \nabla^*_U X + C(U,X)\xi. \tag{4}$$

The tensor C holds $C(U,X) = -g(\nabla_U N, X) = g(A(U), X)$ and

$$C(X,Y) - C(Y,X) = g(N, [X,Y]).$$

In case of being SL integrable, ∇^* is the induced Levi-Civita connection from (M,g) and Equations (1) and (4) show that its second fundamental form is

$$\mathbb{I}^{SL}(X,Y) = C(X,Y)\xi + B(X,Y)N,$$

where $X, Y \in SL$.

The *curvature tensor of* ∇^L is defined as $R^L_{UV}W = \nabla^L_U \nabla^L_V W - \nabla^L_V \nabla^L_U W - \nabla^L_{[U,V]}W$ and it satisfies

$$R^L_{UV}\xi = R_{UV}\xi \tag{5}$$

and the so called *Gauss-Codazzi equations*

$$\begin{aligned} g(R_{UV}W, X) &= g(R^L_{UV}W, X) + B(U,W)g(A(V),X) \qquad (6)\\ &\quad - B(V,W)g(A(U),X),\\ g(R_{UV}W, \xi) &= \big(\nabla^L_U B\big)(V,W) - \big(\nabla^L_V B\big)(U,W) + \tau(U)B(V,W) \qquad (7)\\ &\quad - \tau(V)B(U,W),\\ g(R_{UV}W, N) &= g(R^L_{UV}W, N), \end{aligned}$$

where $U, V, W \in \mathfrak{X}(L)$ and $X \in SL$. From these equations it can be deduced the following ones.

$$\begin{aligned} g(R_{UV}X, N) &= \big(\nabla^{*L}_U C\big)(V,X) - \big(\nabla^{*L}_V C\big)(U,X) + \tau(V)C(U,X)\\ &\quad - \tau(U)C(V,X), \qquad (8)\\ g(R_{UV}\xi, N) &= C(V, A^*(U)) - C(U, A^*(V)) - d\tau(U,V), \qquad (9) \end{aligned}$$

where $\nabla^{*L}_U C$ is defined as

$$\big(\nabla^{*L}_U C\big)(V,X) = U(C(V,X)) - C(\nabla^L_U V, X) - C(V, \nabla^*_U X).$$

Using Equation (7), we can compute the lightlike sectional curvature respect to ξ of a lightlike plane $\Pi = span(X,\xi)$, where $X \in SL$ is unitary,

$$\mathcal{K}_\xi(\Pi) = \big(\nabla^L_\xi B\big)(X,X) - \big(\nabla^L_X B\big)(\xi,X) + \tau(\xi)B(X,X).$$

In particular, if L is totally umbilic, using Equation (2) we have

$$\mathcal{K}_\xi(\Pi) = \xi(\rho) + \tau(\xi)\rho - \rho^2 \tag{10}$$

and if it is totally geodesic, we have $\mathcal{K}_\xi(\Pi) = 0$ for any lightlike tangent plane Π to L. Since the sign of the lightlike sectional curvature only depends on the lightlike plane and not on the chosen lightlike vector, we can state the following.

Proposition 1 *Let M be a Lorentzian manifold and $p \in M$ such that $\mathcal{K}(\Pi) \neq 0$ for any lightlike plane $\Pi \subset T_pM$. Then, it does not exist any totally geodesic lightlike hypersurface through p.*

As a simple application of this result, the Friedmann models do not possess totally geodesic lightlike hypersurfaces, since its lightlike sectional curvature never vanishes, [11].

3 Riemannian metric induced on a lightlike hypersurface

In this section, we show how to induce a Riemannian metric on a lightlike hypersurface L. The construction depends on the choice of a vector field in a neighborhood of L and, as we will see, it also induces a lightlike vector field and a screen distribution on L. In this sense, the geometric data on L are not independently chosen, but they depend on the arbitrarily chosen vector field.

Take ζ a vector field defined in some open set containig L and denote by α the 1-form metrically equivalent to ζ. Take $\omega = i^*\alpha$, being $i : L \hookrightarrow M$ the canonical inclusion, and consider the tensors $\overline{g} = g + \alpha \otimes \alpha$ and $\widetilde{g} = i^*\overline{g}$.

Lemma 2 *Given a point $p \in L$, the following statements hold.*

1. *$\overline{g}_p$ is degenerate if and only if ζ_p is timelike and unitary for g.*
2. *$\widetilde{g}_p$ is Riemannian if and only if $\zeta_p \notin T_pL$.*

If ζ_p is timelike and $|\zeta_p| > 1$ (resp. < 1), then $\overline{g}$ is Riemannian (resp. Lorentzian). Point 2 of this lemma motivates us to define the following.

Definition 3 *Let L be a lightlike hypersurface of a Lorentzian manifold. A rigging for L is a vector field ζ defined on some open set containing L such that $\zeta_p \notin T_pL$ for each $p \in L$.*

The notion of rigging comes from General Relativity and it is originally defined only over L, see [16]. In our approach it is defined in an open set containing L because we need its properties as a vector field in M.

From now on we fix ζ a rigging for L. It does not only induce a Riemannian metric $\widetilde{g}$ in the whole L, as Lemma 2 asserts, but it also fixes a lightlike vector field in L, which we call rigged vector field.

Definition 4 *The rigged vector field of ζ is the $\widetilde{g}-$metrically equivalent vector field to the 1-form ω and it is denoted by ξ.*

Lemma 5 *The rigged vector field ξ is the unique lightlike vector field in L such that $g(\zeta, \xi) = 1$. Moreover, ξ is $\widetilde{g}$-unitary.*

Proof. Take $v \in TL$ a lightlike vector. Since $\zeta_p \notin TL$, using the definitions of ω and $\widetilde{g}$, we have $\widetilde{g}(\xi, v) = g(\zeta, v) \neq 0$ and $\widetilde{g}(\xi, v) = \widetilde{g}(\xi, \xi)\widetilde{g}(\xi, v)$, thus $\widetilde{g}(\xi, \xi) = 1$. Now, observe that $\widetilde{g}(\xi, \xi) = g(\zeta, \xi)$ and $\widetilde{g}(\xi, \xi) = g(\xi, \xi) + \widetilde{g}(\xi, \xi)^2$. $\square$

We can consider the screen distribution given by $TL \cap \zeta^{\perp}$, which we denote by $SL(\zeta)$, and derive all geometrical objects defined in Section 2. Observe that $SL(\zeta)$ is the $\widetilde{g}$-orthogonal subspace to ξ and the lightlike transverse vector field to $SL(\zeta)$ is given by

$$N = \zeta - \frac{1}{2} g(\zeta, \zeta)\xi.$$

We could have constructed a Riemannian metric on the whole M which would induce a Riemannian metric on L, Lemma 2. However, this construction is too rigid and it restricts the link between the geometry of the ambient and the geometry induced on L. In this paper the key point is not the Riemannian character of the metric $\overline{g}$ on the ambient, but that of the induced metric $\widetilde{g}$ on L.

In [4], after fixing a lightlike vector field $\xi \in \mathfrak{X}(L)$ and a screen distribution SL, a Riemannian metric h is constructed on L defining $h(U,V) = g(U,V) + g(N,U)g(N,V)$, where N is the lightlike transverse vector field determined by ξ and SL. This Riemannian metric h coincides with our construction of $\widetilde{g}$ in the special case that we had considered N as a rigging defined only on L. Neverthess, our approach is slightly different since we construct the Riemannian metric $\widetilde{g}$, the lightlike section ξ and the screen distribution only after fixing a rigging ζ. This allows us to take advantage of the existence of rigging with good properties.

We need the relation between the Levi-Civita connections of both g and $\widetilde{g}$. Call $\widetilde{\nabla}$ the Levi-Civita connection induced on L by $\widetilde{g}$ and $\widetilde{D} = \nabla - \widetilde{\nabla}$, which is a symmetric tensor.

Proposition 6 *Given $U, V, W \in \mathfrak{X}(L)$, it holds*

$$g(\widetilde{D}(U,V),W) = -\frac{1}{2}\Big(\omega(W)(L_\xi\widetilde{g})(U,V) + \omega(U)d\omega(V,W) + \omega(V)d\omega(U,W)\Big),$$

where L_ξ is the Lie derivative along ξ.

Proof. We can suppose that the involved Lie brackets vanish. The Koszul identity leads us to write

$$2g(\nabla_U V, W) = Ug(V,W) + Vg(U,W) - Wg(U,V).$$

Using that $g = \widetilde{g} - \omega \otimes \omega$ and rearranging

$$\begin{aligned}
2g(\nabla_U V, W) &= 2\widetilde{g}(\widetilde{\nabla}_U V, W) - \Big(U\big(\omega\otimes\omega(V,W)\big) + V\big(\omega\otimes\omega(U,W)\big) \\
&\quad - W\big(\omega\otimes\omega(U,V)\big)\Big) \\
&= 2g(\widetilde{\nabla}_U V, W) \\
&\quad - \Big(\widetilde{\nabla}_U(\omega\otimes\omega)(V,W) + \widetilde{\nabla}_V(\omega\otimes\omega)(U,W) - \widetilde{\nabla}_W(\omega\otimes\omega)(U,V)\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Taking into account

$$\begin{aligned}
d\omega(U,V) &= \big(\widetilde{\nabla}_U\omega\big)(V) - \big(\widetilde{\nabla}_V\omega\big)(U), \\
(L_\xi\widetilde{g})(U,V) &= \big(\widetilde{\nabla}_U\omega\big)(V) + \big(\widetilde{\nabla}_V\omega\big)(U),
\end{aligned}$$

the last part of the above expression reduces to

$$\omega(W)(L_\xi\widetilde{g})(U,V) + \omega(V)d\omega(U,W) + \omega(U)d\omega(V,W)$$

and we obtain the desired formula. □

Now, we take $D = \nabla^L - \widetilde{\nabla}$, which we call *difference tensor*. It is also symmetric and $\widetilde{D} - D = B \cdot N$. Therefore it holds

$$\begin{aligned}
g(D(U,V),W) = &-\frac{1}{2}\Big(\omega(W)(L_\xi\widetilde{g})(U,V) + \omega(U)d\omega(V,W) + \omega(V)d\omega(U,W)\Big) \\
&- B(U,V)\omega(W).
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

For convenience, we usually work with D instead of $\widetilde{D}$ because it will simplify some computations in the next section. The following basic identities holds.

Corollary 7 *Given* $U \in \mathfrak{X}(L)$ *and* $X, Y, Z \in SL(\zeta)$*, we have the following.*

1. $\widetilde{g}(D(X,U),X) = g(D(X,U),X) = 0$.
2. $\widetilde{g}(D(X,Y),Z) = g(D(X,Y),Z) = 0$.
3. $\widetilde{g}(D(U,\xi),\xi) = -\tau(U) = -g(\nabla_U \zeta, \xi)$.
4. $-2C(U,X) = d\alpha(U,X) + (L_\zeta g)(U,X) + g(\zeta,\zeta)B(U,X)$.

Now, we relate some geometric object of the lightlike hypersurface L with $\widetilde{g}$.

Proposition 8 *Take* $X, Y, Z \in SL(\zeta)$*. It holds*

1. $\widetilde{\nabla}_X Y = \nabla^*_X Y - \widetilde{g}(\widetilde{\nabla}_X \xi, Y)\xi$*, thus* $\widetilde{g}(\widetilde{\nabla}_X Y, Z) = g(\nabla_X Y, Z)$.
2. $\big(L_\xi \widetilde{g}\big)(X,Y) = -2B(X,Y)$*. In particular* $H = -\widetilde{\operatorname{div}}\xi$.

Proof.

1. From the above corollary $D(X,Y) = a\xi$ for certain a. Thus $\widetilde{\nabla}_X Y = \nabla^*_X Y + \big(C(X,Y) - a\big)\xi$, but
$$C(X,Y) - a = \widetilde{g}(\widetilde{\nabla}_X Y, \xi) = -\widetilde{g}(\widetilde{\nabla}_X \xi, Y).$$
2. It follows taking $U = X, V = Y$ and $W = \xi$ in Formula (11).

□

Remark 9 *From the first point of the above proposition, for all* $X, Y \in SL(\zeta)$,
$$D(X,Y) = \big(C(X,Y) + \widetilde{g}(\widetilde{\nabla}_X \xi, Y)\big)\xi. \tag{12}$$

On the other hand, from the second point, L *is totally geodesic if and only if* ξ *is* $\widetilde{g}$*-orthogonally Killing and it is totally umbilic if and only if* ξ *is* $\widetilde{g}$*-orthogonally conformal.*

Remark 10 *Suppose that* M *is orientable and* L *is a compact lightlike hypersurface. Then* L *is also orientable, and point 2 above implies* $\int_L H d\widetilde{g} = 0$*. In particular, its lightlike mean curvature vanishes somewhere. This fact is a remarkable difference with respect to non-lightlike hypersurfaces.*

In [13], some conditions on a lightlike hypersurface is given to ensure that a lightlike vector field on it can be rescaled to be geodesic. If we choose a suitable rigging for L, then we can get a geodesic rigged vector field.

Lemma 11 *Let* L *be a lightlike hypersurface and* ζ *a rigging for it. If* ζ *is conformal, then* $\nabla_\xi \xi = 0$*, that is,* $\tau(\xi) = 0$*, and* $\tau(X) = -\frac{1}{2}g(\widetilde{\nabla}_\xi \xi, X)$ *for all* $X \in SL(\zeta)$.

Proof. From Corollary 7, $\tau(\xi) = g(\nabla_\xi \zeta, \xi) = 0$. On the other hand, Proposition 6 and Corolary 7 implies
$$\begin{aligned} g(\widetilde{\nabla}_\xi \xi, X) &= -g(\widetilde{D}(\xi,\xi),X) = d\omega(\xi,X) = d\alpha(\xi,X) = -2g(\xi,\nabla_X \zeta) \\ &= -2\tau(X). \end{aligned}$$

□

4 Curvature relations

In this section we relate the curvature tensor R^L derived from the linear connection ∇^L and the curvature tensor $\widetilde{R}$ of $(L, \widetilde{g})$ as a Riemannian manifold itself. This, jointly Gauss-Codazzi equations, allows us to relate the curvature of (M, g) and $(L, \widetilde{g})$. We use the following general lemma.

Lemma 12 *Let R^L, $\widetilde{R}$ be the curvature tensors associated to arbitrary symmetric connections ∇^L, $\widetilde{\nabla}$ on a manifold L. Given $U, V, W \in \mathfrak{X}(L)$ it holds*

$$\begin{aligned} R^L_{UV}W = {} & \widetilde{R}_{UV}W + (\widetilde{\nabla}_U D)(V, W) - (\widetilde{\nabla}_V D)(U, W) \\ & + D(U, D(V, W)) - D(V, D(U, W)), \end{aligned}$$

where $D = \nabla^L - \widetilde{\nabla}$ is the difference tensor.

First, we relate the sectional curvatures of $\widetilde{g}$-orthogonal planes to ξ. In this section we need the adjoint of $\widetilde{\nabla}_U \xi$ as an endomorphism, so for simplicity we will use the notation $S(U) = \widetilde{\nabla}_U \xi$.

Theorem 13 *Let M be a Lorentzian manifold, L a lightlike hypersurface and ζ a rigging for it. If $\Pi = span(X, Y)$, being $X, Y \in SL(\zeta)$ unitary and orthogonal vectors, then*

$$\begin{aligned} K(\Pi) - \widetilde{K}(\Pi) = {} & -C(Y, Y)B(X, X) - C(X, X)B(Y, Y) \\ & + \big(C(X, Y) + C(Y, X)\big)B(X, Y) \\ & + B(X, X)B(Y, Y) - B(X, Y)^2 + \frac{3}{4} d\omega(X, Y)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. From Lemma 12,

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{g}(R^L_{XY}Y - \widetilde{R}_{XY}Y, X) = {} & \widetilde{g}((\widetilde{\nabla}_X D)(Y, Y), X) - \widetilde{g}((\widetilde{\nabla}_Y D)(X, Y), X) \\ & + \widetilde{g}(D(X, D(Y, Y)), X) - \widetilde{g}(D(Y, D(X, Y)), X). \end{aligned}$$

We compute each term. Using Formulas (11) and (12), the first one is

$$\widetilde{g}((\widetilde{\nabla}_X D)(Y, Y), X) = \big(C(Y, Y) + \widetilde{g}(S(Y), Y)\big)\widetilde{g}(S(X), X) + g(S(X), Y)d\omega(X, Y).$$

The second term is computed in a similar way.

$$\widetilde{g}((\widetilde{\nabla}_Y D)(X, Y), X) = \big(C(X, Y) + \widetilde{g}(S(X), Y)\big)\widetilde{g}(S(Y), X) + \frac{1}{2}\widetilde{g}(S(Y), X)d\omega(X, Y).$$

The third one vanishes by Corollary 7. We compute the last one.

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{g}(D(Y, D(X, Y)), X) & = -\frac{1}{2}\widetilde{g}(D(X, Y), \xi)d\omega(Y, X) \\ & = \frac{1}{2}\big(C(X, Y) + \widetilde{g}(S(X), Y)\big)d\omega(X, Y). \end{aligned}$$

Using the identities $d\omega(X, Y) = \widetilde{g}(S(X), Y) - \widetilde{g}(X, S(Y))$ and $\big(L_\xi \widetilde{g}\big)(X, Y) = \widetilde{g}(S(X), Y) + \widetilde{g}(X, S(Y))$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{g}(R^L_{XY}Y - \widetilde{R}_{XY}Y, X) = {} & \frac{1}{2}C(Y, Y)\big(L_\xi \widetilde{g}\big)(X, X) + \frac{1}{4}\big(L_\xi \widetilde{g}\big)(Y, Y)\big(L_\xi \widetilde{g}\big)(X, X) \\ & - \frac{1}{2}C(X, Y)\big(L_\xi \widetilde{g}\big)(X, Y) - \widetilde{g}(S(X), Y)\widetilde{g}(S(Y), X) + \frac{1}{2}d\omega(X, Y)^2. \end{aligned}$$

We can express

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{g}(S(X),Y)\widetilde{g}(S(Y),X) &= \frac{1}{4}\Big(\big(L_\xi\widetilde{g}\big)(X,Y)+d\omega(X,Y)\Big)\Big(\big(L_\xi\widetilde{g}\big)(X,Y)-d\omega(X,Y)\Big)\\ &= \frac{1}{4}\big(L_\xi\widetilde{g}\big)(X,Y)^2-\frac{1}{4}d\omega(X,Y)^2,\end{aligned}$$

thus

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{g}(R^L_{XY}Y-\widetilde{R}_{XY}Y,X) &= \frac{1}{2}C(Y,Y)\big(L_\xi\widetilde{g}\big)(X,X)+\frac{1}{4}\big(L_\xi\widetilde{g}\big)(X,X)\big(L_\xi\widetilde{g}\big)(Y,Y)\\ &\quad -\frac{1}{2}C(X,Y)\big(L_\xi\widetilde{g}\big)(X,Y)-\frac{1}{4}\big(L_\xi\widetilde{g}\big)(X,Y)^2+\frac{3}{4}d\omega(X,Y)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, using Proposition 8 and the Gauss-Codazzi equation (6), we get the result. □

Observe that if L is totally geodesic, then $K(\Pi)\geq\widetilde{K}(\Pi)$ for any tangent plane contained in $SL(\zeta)$.

Now, consider $S^*:\mathfrak{X}(L)\to\mathfrak{X}(L)$ the adjoint endomorphism of S. We can decompose $S^*(U)$ as

$$S^*(U)=S^{*\perp}(U)+\widetilde{g}(\widetilde{\nabla}_\xi\xi,U)\xi, \tag{13}$$

where $S^{*\perp}(U)$ is $\widetilde{g}$-orthogonal to ξ. Observe that $S^*(\xi)=0$.

Definition 14 *We say that the rigged vector field ξ is orthogonally normal if*

$$\widetilde{g}(S(X),S(X))=\widetilde{g}(S^{*\perp}(X),S^{*\perp}(X)) \tag{14}$$

for all $X\in SL(\zeta)$.

There are two important cases where the rigged vector field is orthogonally normal: if $SL(\zeta)$ is integrable and if L is totally umbilic. Indeed, if $SL(\zeta)$ is integrable, then ξ is $\widetilde{g}$-*irrotational*. Therefore $S^{*\perp}(X)=S(X)$ for all $X\in SL(\zeta)$ and obviously Equation (14) is satisfied. On the other hand, if L is totally umbilic, from Remark 9, $S^{*\perp}(X)=2\rho X-S(X)$ for certain $\rho\in C^\infty(L)$ and all $X\in SL(\zeta)$ and Equation (14) can be easily checked.

Now, we state a formula relating the lightlike sectional and the $\widetilde{g}$-sectional curvature of planes containing ξ in the case of being orthogonally normal.

Theorem 15 *Let M be a Lorentzian manifold, L a lightlike hypersurface and ζ a rigging for L. Suppose that its rigged vector field ξ is orthogonally normal. If $\Pi=span(X,\xi)$, where $X\in SL(\zeta)$ is a unitary vector, then*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{K}_\xi(\Pi)-\widetilde{K}(\Pi) &= \tau(\xi)B(X,X)-\widetilde{g}(\widetilde{\nabla}_X\widetilde{\nabla}_\xi\xi,X)+\widetilde{g}(X,\widetilde{\nabla}_\xi\xi)^2\\ &\quad+\frac{1}{2}\big(\widetilde{g}(S^2(X),X)-\widetilde{g}(S(X),S(X)\big).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Applying Lemma 12, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{g}\big(R^L_{X\xi}\xi-\widetilde{R}_{X\xi}\xi,X\big) &= \widetilde{g}\big((\widetilde{\nabla}_XD)(\xi,\xi),X\big)-\widetilde{g}\big((\widetilde{\nabla}_\xi D)(X,\xi),X\big)\\ &\quad+\widetilde{g}\big(D(X,D(\xi,\xi)),X\big)-\widetilde{g}\big(D(\xi,D(X,\xi)),X\big).\end{aligned}$$

We compute each term. For the first one,

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{g}\big((\widetilde{\nabla}_X D)(\xi,\xi),X\big) &= \widetilde{g}(\widetilde{\nabla}_X D(\xi,\xi),X) + d\omega(\widetilde{\nabla}_X\xi,X)\\ &= -\tau(\xi)\widetilde{g}(S(X),X) - \widetilde{g}(\widetilde{\nabla}_X\widetilde{\nabla}_\xi\xi,X) + d\omega(\widetilde{\nabla}_X\xi,X).\end{aligned}$$

The second one is

$$\widetilde{g}\big((\widetilde{\nabla}_\xi D)(X,\xi),X\big) = -\widetilde{g}(D(X,\xi),\widetilde{\nabla}_\xi X) - \widetilde{g}(D(\widetilde{\nabla}_\xi X,\xi),X),$$

but

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{g}(D(X,\xi),\widetilde{\nabla}_\xi X) &= g(D(X,\xi),\widetilde{\nabla}_\xi X) + \widetilde{g}(D(X,\xi),\xi)\widetilde{g}(\widetilde{\nabla}_\xi X,\xi)\\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\big(\widetilde{g}(\xi,\widetilde{\nabla}_\xi X)(L_\xi\widetilde{g})(X,\xi) + d\omega(X,\widetilde{\nabla}_\xi X)\big) + \tau(X)\widetilde{g}(S(\xi),X)\\ &= \frac{1}{2}\widetilde{g}(S(\xi),X)^2 - \frac{1}{2}d\omega(X,\widetilde{\nabla}_\xi X) + \tau(X)\widetilde{g}(S(\xi),X).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{g}\big((\widetilde{\nabla}_\xi D)(X,\xi),X\big) &= -\frac{1}{2}\widetilde{g}(S(\xi),X)^2 + \frac{1}{2}d\omega(X,\widetilde{\nabla}_\xi X) - \tau(X)\widetilde{g}(S(\xi),X)\\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\big(d\omega(\widetilde{\nabla}_\xi X,X) + \widetilde{g}(\widetilde{\nabla}_\xi X,\xi)d\omega(\xi,X)\big)\\ &= -\widetilde{g}(X,S(\xi))^2 - \tau(X)\widetilde{g}(S(\xi),X).\end{aligned}$$

The third one is zero due to Corollary 7. The last one is

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{g}\big(D(\xi,D(X,\xi)),X\big) &= -\frac{1}{2}\big(d\omega(D(X,\xi),X) + \widetilde{g}(D(X,\xi),\xi)d\omega(\xi,X)\big)\\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\big(\widetilde{g}(\widetilde{\nabla}_{D(X,\xi)}\xi,X) - \widetilde{g}(D(X,\xi),\widetilde{\nabla}_X\xi) - \tau(X)\widetilde{g}(S(\xi),X)\big)\\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\widetilde{g}(\widetilde{\nabla}_{D(X,\xi)}\xi,X) - \frac{1}{4}d\omega(X,\widetilde{\nabla}_X\xi) + \frac{1}{2}\tau(X)\widetilde{g}(S(\xi),X).\end{aligned}$$

Now, using Formula (5),

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{g}\big(R_{X\xi}\xi - \widetilde{R}_{X\xi}\xi,X\big) &= -\tau(\xi)\widetilde{g}(S(X),X) - \widetilde{g}(\widetilde{\nabla}_X\widetilde{\nabla}_\xi\xi,X) + \widetilde{g}(X,S(\xi))^2\\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\tau(X)\widetilde{g}(S(\xi),X) + \frac{1}{2}\widetilde{g}(\widetilde{\nabla}_{D(X,\xi)}\xi,X) + \frac{3}{4}d\omega(\widetilde{\nabla}_X\xi,X).\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we use that ξ is orthogonally normal to compute the last part of the above formula. Taking into account Formulas (11), (13) and Corollary 7

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\widetilde{g}(\widetilde{\nabla}_{D(X,\xi)}\xi,X) + \frac{3}{4}d\omega(\widetilde{\nabla}_X\xi,X) = \frac{1}{2}\widetilde{g}(D(X,\xi),S^*(X)) + \frac{3}{4}d\omega(S(X),X)\\ &= -\frac{1}{4}d\omega(X,S^{*\perp}(X)) + \frac{3}{4}d\omega(S(X),X) - \frac{1}{2}\tau(X)\widetilde{g}(S(\xi),X)\\ &= \frac{1}{2}\big(\widetilde{g}(S^2(X),X) - \widetilde{g}(S(X),S(X)\big) - \frac{1}{2}\tau(X)\widetilde{g}(S(\xi),X),\end{aligned}$$

and we obtain the desired result. □

Corollary 16 *Let L be a lightlike hypersurface and ζ a rigging for it. Suppose that its rigged vector field ξ is orthogonally normal. Then*

$$Ric(\xi) = \widetilde{Ric}(\xi) + \tau(\xi)H - \widetilde{\operatorname{div}}\widetilde{\nabla}_\xi \xi + \frac{1}{2}\big(tr(S^2) - |S^\perp|^2\big),$$

where tr denotes the trace and $|S^\perp|^2 = \sum_{i=3}^n \widetilde{g}(S(e_i), S(e_i))$, being $\{e_3, \ldots, e_n\}$ an orthonormal basis of $SL(\zeta)$.

Observe that the last part of the formula in Theorem 15 and Corollary 16 has sign. Indeed, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, $\widetilde{g}(S^2(X), X) \leq \widetilde{g}(S(X), S(X))$.

We finish this section with two theorems that in different conditions lead us to identify totally geodesic lightlike hypersurfaces. We say that a Lorentzian manifold satisfies the null convergence condition if $Ric(u) \geq 0$ for any lightlike vector $u \in TM$. It holds the reverse null convergence condition if $Ric(u) \leq 0$ for any lightlike vector u.

Theorem 17 *Let M be an orientable Lorentzian manifold with dimension greater than three which obeys the reverse null convergence condition. If there exists a timelike conformal vector field on M, then any compact umbilic lightlike hypersurface is totally geodesic.*

Proof. Let L be a lightlike umbilic hypersurface with $B = \rho g$ and $\xi \in \mathfrak{X}(L)$ the rigged vector field of the timelike conformal vector field. From Proposition 8, $\big(L_\xi \widetilde{g}\big)(X, Y) = -2\rho \widetilde{g}(X, Y)$ for all $X, Y \in SL$, thus

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{g}(S^2(X), X) &= -\widetilde{g}(S(X), S(X)) - 2\rho\widetilde{g}(S(X), X) \\ &= -\widetilde{g}(S(X), S(X)) + 2\rho^2 \widetilde{g}(X, X), \end{aligned}$$

where, as always, $S(X) = \widetilde{\nabla}_X \xi$, Therefore $tr(S^2) = -|S^\perp|^2 + 2(n-2)\rho^2$ and applying Lemma 11 and Corollary 16,

$$Ric(\xi) - \widetilde{Ric}(\xi) = -\widetilde{\operatorname{div}}\widetilde{\nabla}_\xi \xi + tr(S^2) - (n-2)\rho^2.$$

Integrating respect to $\widetilde{g}$,

$$\int_L Ric(\xi) = \int_L \widetilde{Ric}(\xi) + tr(S^2) - (n-2)\rho^2,$$

and using the following Bochner formula $\int_L \widetilde{Ric}(\xi) + tr(S^2) = \int_L tr(S)^2 = \int_L (n-2)^2\rho^2$, we get

$$\int_L Ric(\xi) = \int_L (n-2)(n-3)\rho^2.$$

Since M holds the reverse null convergence condition, $\rho = 0$ so L is totally geodesic. $\square$

Example 18 *This example holds the assumptions of the above theorem. Take the torus $\mathbb{T}^n = \big(\mathbb{S}^1 \times \ldots \times \mathbb{S}^1, dx_1 dx_2 + \sum_{i=3}^n dx_i^2\big)$. It is flat and $L = \{x \in \mathbb{T}^n : x_2 = 0\}$ is a compact and totally geodesic lightlike hypersurface.*

Theorem 19 *Let M be a Lorentzian manifold satisfying the null convergence condition and L a lightlike hypersurface. If it exists a complete, geodesic and lightlike vector field $\xi \in \mathfrak{X}(L)$, then L is totally geodesic.*

Proof. Take SL any screen distribution in L. Since $\nabla_X \xi, \nabla_\xi X \in TL$ for all $X \in SL$, we have

$$g(R_{X\xi}\xi, X) = \xi(g(A^*(X), X)) - g(A^*(A^*(X)), X) - 2g(\nabla_\xi X, A^*(X)).$$

Take $\{e_3, \ldots, e_n\}$ an orthonormal basis of eigenvectors of A^* at p and extend it to an orthonormal basis $\{E_3, \ldots, E_n\}$ of SL in a neighborhood of p. Then, $g(\nabla_\xi E_i, A^*(E_i))_p = \lambda_i g((\nabla_\xi E_i)_p, e_i) = 0$. Therefore,

$$Ric(\xi) = \sum_{i=3}^{n} g(R_{e_i\xi}\xi, e_i) = \xi(H) - |A^*|^2.$$

Using the null convergence condition and the inequality $\frac{1}{n-2}(trA^*)^2 \leq |A^*|^2$, we get $0 \leq \xi(H) - \frac{1}{n-2}H^2$. Since ξ is complete, $H = 0$, thus $A^* = 0$. $\square$

Corollary 20 *Let M be a lightlike complete Lorentzian manifold furnished with a timelike conformal vector field.*

1. *If M holds the null convergence condition, then any closed lightlike hypersurface is totally geodesic.*
2. *If $\mathcal{K}(\Pi) > 0$ for all degenerate plane Π, then it can not exist any closed lightlike hypersurface.*

Proof. Suppose that L is a closed lightlike hypersurface. Since M is lightlike complete and the rigged vector field ξ of the conformal vector field is geodesic (Lemma 11), it follows that ξ is a complete vector field. If the null convergence condition holds, applying Theorem 19 we get that L is totally geodesic.

If we suppose $\mathcal{K}(\Pi) > 0$, then M holds the null convergence condition. Using the above point, L would be totally geodesic, but by Proposition 1, a totally geodesic lightlike hypersurface has zero lightlike sectional curvature. Contradiction. $\square$

Example 21 *Using the above corollary, the following Lorentzian manifolds do not admit any closed lightlike hypersurface.*

1. *The generalized Robertson-Walker space $\left(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^n, -dt^2 + (1+t^2)^2 g_c\right)$ is lightlike complete, [15], and $\mathcal{K}(\Pi) > 0$ for all lightlike plane Π, see [11]. Moreover, ∂_t is timelike and conformal.*
2. *The Lorentzian Berger sphere $(\mathbb{S}^{2n+1}, g_L)$ is a complete Lorentzian manifold and it holds $\mathcal{K}(\Pi) > 0$ for all lightlike plane Π. Moreover, the Hopf vector field is timelike and Killing, [12].*

5 Integrable screen distribution

If we take a closed rigging ζ, its rigged vector field ξ is also closed, so the screen distribution $SL(\zeta)$ is integrable. In fact, it is enough to consider an irrotational rigging, but we will take a closed one because it will simplify computations. We call $\widetilde{\mathbb{I}}$ the second fundamental form of $(SL(\zeta), \widetilde{g})$ inside $(L, \widetilde{g})$.

Proposition 22 *Let L be a lightlike hypersurface and ζ a closed rigging for it with rigged vector field ξ. Given $X, Y \in SL(\zeta)$ and $U \in \mathfrak{X}(L)$ it holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\nabla}_X Y &= \nabla^*_X Y + B(X,Y)\xi, \\ \widetilde{\nabla}_U \xi &= -A^*(U). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $\widetilde{\nabla}_\xi \xi = 0$ and $\widetilde{\mathbb{I}}(X,Y) = B(X,Y)\xi$.

Proof. Being ξ closed and unitary, $\widetilde{\nabla}_\xi \xi = 0$ and $\big(L_\xi \widetilde{g}\big)(X,Y) = 2\widetilde{g}(\widetilde{\nabla}_X \xi, Y)$. From Proposition 8 we have $B(X,Y) = -\widetilde{g}(\widetilde{\nabla}_X \xi, Y)$ and $\widetilde{\nabla}_X Y = \nabla^*_X Y + B(X,Y)\xi$. Moreover, since $B(X,Y) = g(A^*(X), Y)$, it follows $\widetilde{\nabla}_X \xi = -A^*(X)$. □

An inmediate consequence of the above proposition is the following.

Corollary 23 *Let L be a lightlike hypersurface and ζ a closed rigging for it. Then*

1. *L is totally geodesic if and only if the rigged vector field ξ is $\widetilde{g}$-parallel.*
2. *L is totally geodesic (resp. umbilic) if and only if each leaf of $SL(\zeta)$ is totally geodesic (resp. umbilic) as a hypersurface of $(L, \widetilde{g})$.*

Compare point 1 and 2 above with Remark 9. This shows the advantage of taking a rigging with good properties.

Proposition 24 *Let L be a lightlike hypersurface and ζ a closed rigging for it. Then $\widetilde{g}(\widetilde{\nabla}_U V, W) = g(\nabla_U V, W) + \omega(W)U(\omega(V))$ for all $U, V, W \in \mathfrak{X}(L)$.*

Proof. Given $X, Y, Z \in SL(\zeta)$, from Proposition 8 and 22, $\widetilde{g}(\widetilde{\nabla}_X Y, Z) = g(\nabla_X Y, Z)$ and $\widetilde{g}(\widetilde{\nabla}_X \xi, Y) = g(\nabla_X \xi, Y)$ respectively. Using these equations it can be checked that $\widetilde{g}(\widetilde{\nabla}_U Y, W) = g(\nabla_U Y, W)$ and $\widetilde{g}(\widetilde{\nabla}_U \xi, W) = g(\nabla_U \xi, W)$ for all $U, W \in \mathfrak{X}(L)$ and $Y \in SL(\zeta)$. Now, if we take $V = \omega(V)\xi + Y$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{g}(\widetilde{\nabla}_U V, W) &= U(\omega(V))\omega(W) + \omega(V)\widetilde{g}(\widetilde{\nabla}_U \xi, W) + \widetilde{g}(\widetilde{\nabla}_U Y, W) \\ &= U(\omega(V))\omega(W) + g(\nabla_U V, W). \end{aligned}$$

□

The following theorem gives us the local structure of a totally umbilic lightlike hypersurface if we consider the induced metric $\widetilde{g}$ from a closed rigging.

Theorem 25 *Let (M,g) be a Lorentzian manifold, L a totally umbilic lightlike hypersurface and ζ a closed rigging for L. Given $p \in L$, $(L,\widetilde{g})$ is locally isometric to a twisted product $(\mathbb{R}\times S, dr^2+\lambda^2 g|_S)$, where the rigged vector field ξ is identified with ∂_r, S is the leaf of $SL(\zeta)$ through p and*

$$\lambda(r,q)=exp\left(-\int_0^r \frac{H(\phi_s(q))}{n-2}ds\right),$$

being ϕ the flow of ξ. In particular, dH is proportional to ω if and only if $(L,\widetilde{g})$ is locally isometric to a warped product and L is totally geodesic if and only if $(L,\widetilde{g})$ is locally isometric to a direct product.

Moreover, if L is simply connected and ξ is complete, the above decomposition is global.

Proof. For simplicity, we suppose that ξ is complete. Since $d\omega=0$, Cartan formula implies $L_\xi\omega=0$, so the flow ϕ of ξ is foliated, that is, $\phi_r(S_q)=S_{\phi_r(q)}$ for all $q\in L$ and $r\in\mathbb{R}$, being S_q the leaf of $SL(\zeta)$ through q. Using this, it is easy to check that $\phi:\mathbb{R}\times S_p\to L$ is onto and a local diffeomorphism. From Proposition 8, $\left(L_\xi\widetilde{g}\right)(X,Y)=-2\frac{H}{n-2}\widetilde{g}(X,Y)$ for all $X,Y\in SL(\zeta)$. Therefore $\phi_r:S_q\to S_{\phi_r(q)}$ is a conformal diffeomorphism with conformal factor $\exp\left(-2\int_0^r\frac{H(\phi_s(q))}{n-2}ds\right)$ and it follows that $\phi^*(\widetilde{g})=dr^2+\lambda^2 g|_{S_p}$, being $\lambda(r,q)=exp\left(-\int_0^r\frac{H(\phi_s(q))}{n-2}ds\right)$.

We show now that ϕ is a covering map. Let $\sigma:[0,1]\to L$ be a $\widetilde{g}$-geodesic and $(r_0,x_0)\in\mathbb{R}\times S_p$ a point such that $\phi(r_0,x_0)=\sigma(0)$. We must show that there exists a lift $\alpha:[0,1]\to\mathbb{R}\times S_p$ of σ through ϕ starting at (r_0,x_0), [14]. There is a $\widetilde{g}$-geodesic $\alpha:[0,s_0)\to\mathbb{R}\times S_p$, $\alpha(s)=(r(s),x(s))$, such that $\phi\circ\alpha=\sigma$ and $\alpha(0)=(r_0,x_0)$ because ϕ is a local isometry. If we suppose $s_0<1$, there is a geodesic $(r_1(s),x_1(s))$ such that $\phi(r_1(s),x_1(s))=\sigma(s)$ with $s\in(s_0-\varepsilon,s_0+\varepsilon)$, then in the open interval $(s_0-\varepsilon,s_0)$ it holds $\phi(r(s),x(s))=\phi((r_1(s),x_1(s))$. Differentiating and using that ϕ is foliated, it is easy to see that $r_1(s)-r(s)=c\in\mathbb{R}$. Therefore, it exists $\lim_{s\to s_0}\alpha(s)$ and the $\widetilde{g}$-geodesic α is extendible. $\Box$

Remark 26 *Locally, it always exists a closed timelike vector field, so we can apply the above proposition to any totally umbilic lightlike hypersurface.*

We can also obtain the global decomposition assuming the existence of a timelike gradient field on M instead of the simply connectedness of L. Indeed, suppose that $f\in C^\infty(M)$ is a function with $\zeta=\nabla f$ timelike. If $\gamma:\mathbb{R}\to L$ is an integral curve of ξ, then $f(\gamma(t))$ is increasing (or decreasing), and since f is constant along the leaves of $SL(\zeta)$, γ intersects any leaf of $SL(\zeta)$ at only one point. Therefore, ϕ is injective and L splits globally as $\mathbb{R}\times S$. Recall that in a stably causal space it always exists a timelike gradient field.

Compactness is an obstruction to get the global decomposition of a totally umbilic lightlike hypersuperface. Even more, a timelike gradient field prevents the existence of compact lightlike hypersurfaces (not necessarily totally umbilic). In fact, in L we can decompose $\nabla f=X+a\xi+bN$, being $X\in SL(\zeta)$ and $a,b\in C^\infty(L)$. Now, $\widetilde{\nabla} f\circ i=X+b\xi$ and, by compactness, there is a point in L where $\widetilde{\nabla} f\circ i=0$, but then ∇f is lightlike in this point, which is a contradiction.

Given Θ a normal neighborhood of a point $p \in M$, we call $\widehat{\Theta} = exp_p^{-1}(\Theta)$ and $\widehat{C}_p^+$, $\widehat{C}_p^-$ and $\widehat{P}$ the future cone, the past cone and the position vector field respectively in T_pM.

Definition 27 *The local future and the local past lightcone at* p *are defined as*

$$C_p^+ = exp_p(\widehat{C}_p^+ \cap \widehat{\Theta}),\ C_p^- = exp_p(\widehat{C}_p^- \cap \widehat{\Theta})$$

and the local position vector field as $P_{exp(v)} = (exp_p)_{*_v}(\widehat{P}_v)$.

The following proposition shows what intuitively seems clear.

Proposition 28 *Let* M *be a Lorentzian manifold. The local future (past) lightcone can not be totally geodesic for any* $p \in M$.

Proof. Take $\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}$ an orthonormal basis at p with e_1 timelike and $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ normal coordinates around p with $\partial_{x_i}(p) = e_i$. Then $\zeta = \nabla x_1$ is a rigging for C_p^+ in a neighborhood of p and its rigged vector field is given by $\xi = \frac{P}{x_1}$. Since ζ is closed, $SL(\zeta)$ is integrable and the leaf of $SL(\zeta)$ through $exp_p(v)$, where $v = \sum_{i=1}^n v_i e_i \in \hat{C}_p^+$, is given by

$$S_{exp_p(v)} = \{exp_p\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i e_i\right) : x_2^2 + \ldots + x_n^2 = x_1^2;\ x_1 = v_1\}.$$

Obviously $lim_{t\to 0^+} vol(S_{exp_p(tv)}) = 0$, but if C_p^+ were totally geodesic, by Theorem 25, $(C_p^+, \widetilde{g})$ would decompose as $\left((0,\varepsilon) \times S_{exp(v)}, dt^2 + g|_{S_{exp(v)}}\right)$ and in this case $vol(S_{exp_p(tv)}) = vol(S_{exp_p(v)})$ for all $t \in (0,\varepsilon)$, which is a contradiction. $\square$

We can consider a leaf of $SL(\zeta)$ as a submanifold of (M, g) or $(L, \widetilde{g})$. In the first case, we know that the induced Levi-Civita connection is ∇^* and its second fundamental form is $\mathbb{I}^{SL(\zeta)}(X,Y) = C(X,Y)\xi + B(X,Y)N$. In the second case, the induced connection from $(L, \widetilde{g})$ is also ∇^* but its second fundamental form is $\mathbb{I}(X,Y) = B(X,Y)\xi$. Therefore, if we call K^S and $\widetilde{K}^S$ the induced sectional curvatures on a leaf S of $SL(\zeta)$ from (M,g) and $(L,\widetilde{g})$ respectively, then

$$\begin{aligned}
K^S(\Pi) &= \widetilde{K}^S(\Pi),\\
K(\Pi) &= K^S(\Pi) - C(X,X)B(Y,Y) - B(X,X)C(Y,Y)\\
&\quad + 2C(X,Y)B(X,Y),\\
\widetilde{K}(\Pi) &= \widetilde{K}^S(\Pi) - B(X,X)B(Y,Y) + B(X,Y)^2,
\end{aligned}$$

for any tangent plane $\Pi = span(X,Y)$ to $SL(\zeta)$. Moreover, from Theorem 15 and Corollary 16 we have the following.

Corollary 29 *Let* L *be a lightlike hypersurface and* ζ *a closed rigging for it. Then*

1. $\mathcal{K}_\xi(\Pi) = \widetilde{K}(\Pi) + \tau(\xi)\frac{B(X,X)}{g(X,X)}$, *where* $\Pi = span(\xi, X)$ *and* $X \in SL(\zeta)$.
2. $Ric(\xi) = \widetilde{Ric}(\xi) + \tau(\xi)H$.

If we consider a closed rigging, then an explicit relation between $\widetilde{R}$ and R^L can be given. For this, recall that in this case C is a symmetric tensor and using point 3 and 4 of Corollary 7, $C(\xi, X) = -\tau(X)$ for all $X \in SL(\zeta)$. We need a previous lemma.

Lemma 30 *Let L be a lightlike hypersurface and ζ a closed rigging for it. Take $U, V \in \mathfrak{X}(L)$ and $X \in SL(\zeta)$.*

1. *The difference tensor $D = \nabla^L - \widetilde{\nabla}$ is given by*
$$\begin{aligned} D(U,X) &= \big(C(U,X) - B(U,X)\big)\xi, \\ D(U,\xi) &= -\tau(U)\xi. \end{aligned}$$
2. *$\widetilde{\nabla}_U B = \nabla^L_U B$.*
3. *The derivative of D with respect to $\widetilde{\nabla}$ is given by*
$$\begin{aligned} \big(\widetilde{\nabla}_U D\big)(V,X) = \Big(&\big(\nabla^{*L}_U C\big)(V,X) - \big(\nabla^L_U B\big)(V,X) + \tau(V)B(U,X)\Big)\xi \\ &- A^*(U)C(V,X) + A^*(U)B(V,X) + D(D(U,V),X), \end{aligned}$$
$$\begin{aligned} \big(\widetilde{\nabla}_U D\big)(V,\xi) = \big(&-U(\tau(V)) + \tau(\widetilde{\nabla}_V U) + C(V, A^*(U)) - B(V, A^*(U))\big)\xi \\ &+ \tau(V)A^*(U). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. To prove the first point, apply Formula (12) and Proposition 8 and 22. For the second point just take into account that $B(X,\xi) = 0$. Third point is a straightforward computation. □

Theorem 31 *Let (M,g) be a Lorentzian manifold, L a lightlike hypersurface and ζ a closed rigging for it. Take $U, V \in \mathfrak{X}(L)$ and $X \in SL(\zeta)$. Then*
$$\begin{aligned} R^L_{UV}X - \widetilde{R}_{UV}X &= \big(g(R_{UV}X, N) - g(R_{UV}X, \xi)\big)\xi \\ &\quad + C(U,X)A^*(V) - C(V,X)A^*(U) \\ &\quad + B(U,X)\nabla_V\xi - B(V,X)\nabla_U\xi, \\ R^L_{UV}\xi - \widetilde{R}_{UV}\xi &= g(R_{UV}\xi, N)\xi - \tau(U)A^*(V) + \tau(V)A^*(U). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The first formula follows using Lemma 12 and 30 and Formulas (7) and (8). We can get the second one using again Lemma 12 and 30 and Formulas (3) and (9). □

More accurated relations can be obtained if L is totally geodesic.

Corollary 32 *Let L be a totally geodesic lightlike hypersurface and ζ a closed rigging for it. Given $U, V, W \in \mathfrak{X}(L)$ and $X, Y \in SL(\zeta)$ it holds the following.*

1. *$R_{UV}W - \widetilde{R}_{UV}W = g(R_{UV}W, N)\xi$, for all $U, V, W \in \mathfrak{X}(L)$.*

2. *If* $\Pi = span\{X, U\}$ *is a tangent plane to* L, *then*

$$K(\Pi) = \left(1 + \frac{g(X,X)\widetilde{g}(U,\xi)^2}{g(X,X)g(U,U) - g(X,U)^2}\right)\widetilde{K}(\Pi) \text{ if } \Pi \text{ is spacelike,}$$
$$\mathcal{K}_\xi(\Pi) = \widetilde{K}(\Pi) = 0 \text{ if } \Pi \text{ is lightlike.}$$

3. *The Ricci tensor of* $\widetilde{g}$ *is given by*

$$\widetilde{Ric}(X,Y) = Ric(X,Y) - g(R_{\xi X}Y, N) - g(R_{\xi Y}X, N),$$
$$\widetilde{Ric}(\xi, U) = Ric(\xi, U) = 0.$$

4. *If* $\widetilde{s}$ *and* s *denote the scalar curvature of* $(L, \widetilde{g})$ *and* (M, g) *respectively, then*

$$s - \widetilde{s} = 4Ric(\xi, N) - 2K\big(span(\xi, N)\big).$$

Proof. The first point follows inmmediately from the above theorem and Gauss-Codazzi equations. Since $(L, \widetilde{g})$ is locally a direct product $\mathbb{R}\times S$ with ξ identified with ∂_r (Theorem 25), it is obvious that $\widetilde{Ric}(\xi, U) = 0$. The rest is a straightforward computation. $\square$

6 Lightcones in generalized Robertson-Walker spaces

Take I an open interval of $\mathbb{R}$, $f \in C^\infty(I)$ a positive function and (F, g_F) a Riemannian manifold. Let (M, g) be a generalized Robertson-Walker (GRW) space $\big(I \times F, -dt^2 + f(t)^2 g_F\big)$, which is denoted by $I \times_f F$. When F has constant curvature, M is called a Robertson-Walker (RW) space. The vector field $\zeta = f\partial_t$ is timelike, closed and conformal. We use it as rigging to study umbilic lightlike hypersurfaces in $I \times_f F$. First, we describe lightcones in GRW spaces.

Proposition 33 *Let* $M = I \times_f F$ *be a GRW space and fix* $p_* = (t_*, x_*) \in M$. *If* Θ *is a normal neighborhood of* p_*, *then the local lightcones at* p_* *are given by*

$$C^+_{p_*} = \{(t,x) \in \Theta : \int_{t_*}^{t} \frac{1}{f(r)}dr = d_F(x_*, x)\},$$
$$C^-_{p_*} = \{(t,x) \in \Theta : \int_{t}^{t_*} \frac{1}{f(r)}dr = d_F(x_*, x)\},$$

being d_F *the Riemannian distance in* F. *Moreover, the local position vector field at* p_* *is given by*

$$P_{(t,x)} = \int_{t_*}^{t} \frac{f(r)}{f(t)}dr\, \partial_t + \frac{\int_{t_*}^{t} \frac{f(r)}{f(t)}dr}{\int_{t_*}^{t} \frac{f(t)}{f(r)}dr} P^F_x,$$

for all $(t,x) \in C^+_{p_*} \cup C^-_{p_*}$, *where* P^F *is the local position vector field at* x_* *in* F.

Proof. Given $(t,x) \in C^+_{p_*}$, it exists a lightlike geodesic $\gamma : J \to C^+_{p_*}$ such that $\gamma(0) = p_*$, $g(\gamma'(0), \zeta_{p_*}) = -1$ and $\gamma(s^*) = (t,x)$ for certain $s^* \in \mathbb{R}$. Since ζ is closed and conformal, $g(\gamma', \zeta)$ is constant and therefore, if $\gamma(s) = (\alpha(s), \beta(s))$, we have $\alpha'(s) f(\alpha(s)) = 1$. Hence $\alpha(s) = a^{-1}(s)$, being $a(s) = \int_{t_*}^{s} f(r)dr$. On the other hand, β is a pregeodesic in F which holds

$$\beta''(s) = -2\frac{d}{ds}\Big(\ln f(\alpha(s))\Big)\beta'(s),$$

so β is given by

$$\beta(s) = exp^F_{x_*}\left(b(s)u\right),$$

where $b(s) = \int_0^s \frac{1}{f(\alpha(r))^2} dr$ and $u \in T_{x_*}F$ with $g_F(u,u) = 1$. Therefore,

$$d_F(x_*, x) = b(s^*) = \int_0^{s^*} \frac{1}{f(\alpha(s))^2} ds = \int_{t_*}^{t} \frac{1}{f(r)} dr.$$

Conversely, take $(t,x) \in \Theta$ such that $d_F(x_*, x) = \int_{t_*}^{t} \frac{1}{f(r)} dr$. If we call $a(s) = \int_{t_*}^{t} f(r)dr$, $b(s) = \int_0^s \frac{1}{f(a^{-1}(r))^2} dr$, $s^* = a(t)$, $\alpha(s) = a^{-1}(s)$ and $\beta(s) = exp^F_{x_*}(b(s)u)$ where $u \in T_{x_*}F$ is such that $exp^F_{x_*}\left(d_F(x_*, x)u\right) = x$, then it is easy to show that $\gamma(s) = (\alpha(s), \beta(s))$ is a future lightlike geodesic in M with $\gamma(0) = p_*$ and $\gamma(s^*) = (t,x)$. Therefore, $(t,x) \in C^+_{p_*}$.

To compute the local position vector field over $C^+_{p_*}$ we observe that for any manifold and any geodesic γ with $\gamma(0) = p_*$, the local position vector field is given by $P_{\gamma(s)} = s\gamma'(s)$. In our particular case, $P_{(t,x)} = s^*\gamma'(s^*)$. Since $\alpha(s^*) = t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} s^* &= \int_{t_*}^{t} f(r)dr, \\ \alpha'(s^*) &= \frac{1}{f(t)}, \\ \beta'(s^*) &= b'(s^*)\left(exp^F_{x_*}\right)_{*b(s^*)u}\Big(u\Big) = \frac{b'(s^*)}{b(s^*)} P^F_x, \end{aligned}$$

where P^F is the local position vector field at x_* in F. Since $b(s^*) = \int_{t_*}^{t} \frac{1}{f(r)} dr$ and $b'(s^*) = \frac{1}{f(t)^2}$, we have

$$P_{(t,x)} = \int_{t_*}^{t} \frac{f(r)}{f(t)} dr\, \partial_t + \frac{\int_{t_*}^{t} \frac{f(r)}{f(t)} dr}{\int_{t_*}^{t} \frac{f(t)}{f(r)} dr} P^F_x.$$

□

The following lemma will be helpful to compute the second fundamental form of a lightcone in a Robertson-Walker space.

Lemma 34 *Let (F, g_F) be a semi-Riemannian manifold, fix $x_* \in F$ and take $\theta \subset F$ a normal neighborhood of x_*. Call $P^F \in \mathfrak{X}(\theta)$ the local position vector field at x_*. If $w \in T_xF$, being $x = exp^F_{x_*}(v) \in \theta$, then*

$$g_F(\nabla^F_w P^F, w) = \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{ds} g(J,J)|_{s=1},$$

where J is the unique Jacobi vector field over $exp^F_{x_*}(sv)$ with $J(0) = 0$ and $J(1) = w$.

Proposition 35 *Local lightcones of a Robertson-Walker space $M = I \times_f F$ are totally umbilic.*

Proof. Fix $p_* = (t_*, x_*) \in M$ and consider $p = (t, x) \in C^+_{p_*}$. From Proposition 33, $\xi_{(t,x)} = \frac{-1}{\int_{t_*}^t f(r)dr} P_{(t,x)}$ is the rigged vector field of $\zeta = f\partial_t$. If $w \in SL(\zeta)_{(t,x)}$, then $g(w, \partial_t) = 0$ and so $w \in T_x F$ with $g(P^F_x, w) = 0$. Therefore,

$$\nabla_w \xi = \frac{-1}{\int_{t_*}^t f(r)dr} \nabla_w P = -\frac{f'(t)}{f(t)^2} w - \frac{1}{f(t)^2 \int_{t_*}^t \frac{1}{f(r)}dr} \nabla_w P^F.$$

Now, we use Lemma 34 and that F has constant curvature k to compute $g_F(\nabla^F_w P^F, w)$. Take $u \in T_{x_*}F$ such that $exp^F_{x_*}(d_F(x, x_*)u) = x$. The Jacobi vector field over $exp^F_{x_*}(s\, d_F(x, x_*)u)$, $0 \leq s \leq 1$, with $J(0) = 0$ and $J(1) = w$ is given by $J(s) = \varphi(s)W(s)$, where W is parallel with $W(1) = w$ and

$$\varphi(s) = \begin{cases} \frac{Sin\left(\sqrt{k} d_F(x,x_*) s\right)}{Sin\left(\sqrt{k} d_F(x,x_*)\right)} & if \quad k > 0, \\ s & if \quad k = 0, \\ \frac{Sinh\left(\sqrt{-k} d_F(x,x_*) s\right)}{Sinh\left(\sqrt{-k} d_F(x,x_*)\right)} & if \quad k < 0. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, $g_F(\nabla^F_w P^F, w) = \varphi'(1) g_F(w, w)$. Since $B(w, w) = -g(\nabla_w \xi, w)$ and $d_F(x, x_*) = \int_{t_*}^t \frac{1}{f(r)}dr$, we have

$$B(w,w) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{f(t)^2}\left(f'(t) + \frac{\sqrt{k}}{Tan\left(\sqrt{k}\int_{t_*}^t \frac{1}{f(r)}dr\right)}\right) g(w,w) & if \quad k > 0, \\ \frac{1}{f(t)^2}\left(f'(t) + \frac{1}{\int_{t_*}^t \frac{1}{f(r)}dr}\right) g(w,w) & if \quad k = 0, \\ \frac{1}{f(t)^2}\left(f'(t) + \frac{\sqrt{-k}}{Tanh\left(\sqrt{-k}\int_{t_*}^t \frac{1}{f(r)}dr\right)}\right) g(w,w) & if \quad k < 0. \end{cases}$$

□

Since $\mathbb{R}^n_1$, $\mathbb{S}^n_1$ and a suitable portion of $\mathbb{H}^n_1$ can be expressed as a RW space, the above proposition shows the well-known fact that lightcones in a Lorentzian manifolds of constant curvature are totally umbilic. On the other hand, by Theorem 25, a lightcone of a RW space with the metric $\widetilde{g}$ decomposes itself as a warped product in a neighborhood of each of its points, where the fibre is a sphere of radius determined by Proposition 33. Table 1 shows such decomposition in a neighborhood of some point (t_0, x_0) of the lightcone at $(0, x_*)$ in the case of Lorentzian space forms.

Theorem 36 *Let $I \times_f F$ be a GRW space and γ a lightlike geodesic in a totally umbilic lightcone with vertex $\gamma(0)$. If J is a Jacobi vector field with $J \in \gamma'^{\perp}$ and non-proportional to γ', then the Jacobi equation along γ is*

$$J'' + \frac{Ric(\gamma', \gamma')}{n-2} J = 0.$$

In particular, a conjugate point of $\gamma(0)$ along γ has maximum multiplicity.

Lorentzian space form	**Lightlike mean curvature of $C^+_{(0,x_*)}$**	**Warped decomposition of $C^+_{(0,x_*)}$**	
		Radius of the fibre through (t_0, x_0)	**Warping function**
$\mathbb{R}^n_1 = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$	$\frac{n-2}{t}$	t_0	$\frac{t_0 - r}{t_0}$
$\mathbb{S}^n_1 = \mathbb{R} \times_{\cosh(t)} \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$	$\frac{n-2}{\sinh(t)}$	$\tanh(t_0)$	$\frac{\sinh(t_0) - r}{\sinh(t_0)}$
A portion of $\mathbb{H}^n_1 = (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}) \times_{\cos(t)} \mathbb{H}^{n-1}$	$\frac{n-2}{\sin(t)}$	$\tan(t_0)$	$\frac{\sin(t_0) - r}{\sin(t_0)}$

Table 1: Decomposition of $C^+_{(0,x_*)}$ in a neighborhood of one of its point (t_0, x_0).

Proof. We call L an open set in the lightcone containing γ. The rigging $\zeta = f\partial_t$ is closed and conformal, so $\tau \equiv 0$ and $C(\xi, X) = 0$ for all $X \in SL(\zeta)$, Corollary 7. Using that L is totally umbilic, we have $\nabla_X \xi = -\rho X$. After a suitable affine reparametrization, γ is an integral curve of ξ, so

$$R_{J\gamma'}\gamma' = R_{J\xi}\xi = \left(\xi(\rho) - \rho^2\right) J.$$

Using Equation (10), we get the result. Finally observe that the Jacobi operator is proportional to the identity, so if there exists a conjugate point, it has maximum multiplicity. □

This theorem is potentially interesting in Cosmology because it is likely that the multiplicity in gravitational lens phenomena, can be detected by astronomical observations. After Proposition 35, conjugate points in Robertson-Walker spaces have maximum multiplicity, see also [8].

Given $M = I \times F$, we call $\pi : M \to F$ and $T : M \to \mathbb{R}$ the canonical projections. If L is a lightlike hypersurface in a GRW space, then $\pi : L \to F$ is a local diffeomorphism and thus, locally, L coincides with the graph of the function given by $h = T \circ \pi^{-1} : \theta \to \mathbb{R}$, where $\theta \subset F$. The lemmas below describe some basic properties of the function h.

Lemma 37 *Let $I \times_f F$ be GRW space, θ an open subset of F and $h : \theta \to \mathbb{R}$ a function. The graph of h is a lightlike hypersurface if and only if*

$$\left|\nabla^F h\right|_F = f \circ h.$$

In this case, $g_F(\nabla^F h, \nabla^F h)\partial_t + \nabla^F h$ is a lightlike vector field.

If h is a map whose graph defines a lightlike hypersurface, then given $v \in TF$ we have

$$g_F(\nabla^F_{\nabla^F h}\nabla^F h, v) = \frac{1}{2}v\left((f\circ h)^2\right) = (f\circ h)(f'\circ h)g_F(v, \nabla^F h).$$

Therefore,

$$\nabla^F_{\nabla^F h}\nabla^F h = (f\circ h)(f'\circ h)\nabla^F h. \tag{15}$$

Lemma 38 *Let $I\times_f F$ be a GRW space, L a lightlike hypersurface given by the graph of a function h and consider the rigging $\zeta = f\partial_t$. The rigged of ζ is given by*

$$\xi = -\frac{1}{f\circ h}\partial_t - \frac{1}{(f\circ h)^3}\nabla^F h,$$

the screen distribution is $SL(\zeta) = \{X \in TF : g_F(X, \nabla^F h) = 0\}$ and the second fundamental form is

$$B(X,Y) = \frac{f'\circ h}{(f\circ h)^2}g(X,Y) + \frac{1}{f\circ h}Hess^F_h(X,Y),$$

where $X, Y \in SL(\zeta)$.

The following theorem shows that only special types of GRW spaces can admit totally umbilic lightlike hypersurfaces.

Theorem 39 *Let $I\times_f F$ be a GRW space. A lightlike hypersurface L is totally umbilic if and only if for each $(t_0, x_0) \in L$ there exists a decomposition of F in a neighborhood of x_0 as a twisted product*

$$\left(J\times S, ds^2 + \mu(s,z)^2 g_S\right),$$

where x_0 is identified with $(0, z_0)$ for some $z_0 \in S$ and L is given by $\{(h(s), s, z) \in I\times J\times S\}$, being $h(s) = c^{-1}(s)$ and $c(t) = \int_{t_0}^t \frac{1}{f(r)}dr$.

Moreover, if we consider the rigging $\zeta = f\partial_t$ and H is the lightlike mean curvature of L, then

$$\mu(s,z) = \frac{f(t_0)}{f(h(s))}exp\left(\int_0^s \frac{H(h(r),r,z)f(h(r))^2}{n-2}dr\right)$$

for all $(s,z) \in J\times S$.

Proof. Suppose that L is given by the graph of certain map $h : \theta \to \mathbb{R}$ in a neighborhood of (t_0, x_0) and that $B = \rho g$. From Formula (15) and Lemma 38 it holds

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla^F_{\nabla^F h}\nabla^F h &= (f\circ h)(f'\circ h)\nabla^F h,\\ \nabla^F_v\nabla^F h &= \left(\rho(f\circ h)^3 - (f\circ h)(f'\circ h)\right)v\end{aligned}$$

for all $v \perp \nabla^F h$. Since $\left|\nabla^F h\right|_F = f\circ h$, we have that $\left|\nabla^F h\right|_F$ is constant through level hypersurfaces of h. Thus, if we call $E = \frac{1}{|\nabla^F h|_F}\nabla^F h$, it is easy to show that

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla^F_E E &= 0,\\ \nabla^F_v E &= \left(\rho(f\circ h)^2 - (f'\circ h)\right)v\end{aligned}$$

for all $v \perp \nabla^F h$. From these equations it follows that E is closed and that $(L_E g_F)(v,w) = 2\big(\rho\,(f\circ h)^2 - (f'\circ h)\big) g_F(v,w)$ for all $v, w \in TF$ with $v, w \perp \nabla^F h$. An analogous proof as in Theorem 25 shows that F decomposes in a neighborhood of x_0 as a twisted product $\big(J \times S, ds^2 + \mu(s,z)^2 g_F|_S\big)$, where S is the level hypersurface of h through x_0, E is identified with ∂_s, x_0 with $(0, x_0)$ and μ is given by

$$\mu(s,z) = exp\left(\int_0^s \big(\rho(\phi_r(z)) f(h(\phi_r(z)))^2 - f'(h(\phi_r(z)))\big)\, dr\right),$$

being ϕ the flow of E. But in this decomposition, h only depends on s and $(\ln f\circ h)' = f'\circ h$, so the above simplifies to

$$\mu(s,z) = \frac{f(t_0)}{f(h(s))} exp\left(\int_0^s \rho(\phi_r(z)) f(h(r))^2 dr\right).$$

Finally, from Lema 37 we have that $h(s) = c^{-1}(s)$ being $c(t) = \int_{t_0}^t \frac{1}{f(r)} dr$.

The converse follows easily, since from Lemma 38 the second fundamental form respect to the rigging $f\partial_t$ of L is given by

$$B = \frac{1}{f(h(s))^2}\left(f'(h(s)) + \frac{\mu_s}{\mu}\right) g.$$

□

Observe that $\mu(0,z) = 1$ for all $z \in S$. On the other hand, if L is totally geodesic, then $\mu(s,z) = \frac{f(t_0)}{f(h(s))}$ and we obtain a local decomposition of F as a warped product instead of as a twisted product. Finally, observe that the theorem can be applied to any lightlike surface in a three dimensional GRW space, since they are always totally umbilic.

Totally geodesic lightlike hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{R}^n_1$ are given by lightlike hyperplanes. In $\mathbb{S}^n_1$ and $\mathbb{H}^n_1$, we can obtain totally geodesic lightlike hypersurfaces intersecting them with lightlike planes through the origin of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_1$ and $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_2$ respectively. Table 2 shows how Theorem 39 is fulfilled in these cases.

On the other hand, from Proposition 35, Theorem 39 must also be fulfilled for lightcones in Robertson-Walker spaces. To obtain the decompositions that they induce in the fibre, we look for those decompositions where the parameter s is the distance in the fibre from a fixed point and we apply Proposition 33. This is shown in Table 3. Note that we have just applied a translation to include 0 in the domain of the parameter s, as Theorem 39 asserts.

The following lemmas give us alternative characterizations of lightcones in a GRW space.

Lemma 40 *Let $M = I \times_f F$ be a GRW space and $p_* = (t_*, x_*) \in M$ a fixed point. Take L a lightlike hypersurface given by the graph of a function h. Then, L is contained in the local lightcone at p_* if and only if $\lim_{x\to x_*} h(x) = t_*$ and $\nabla^F h$ is proportional to P^F, the local position vector field at x_* in F.*

Proof. Take a lightlike geodesic $\gamma : J \to M$ such that $\gamma(0) = p_*$ and $\gamma(s) = (\alpha(s), \beta(s))$. We have

$$g_F\left(\nabla^F h, \beta'(s)\right) = (h\circ\beta)'(s),$$
$$\left|\nabla^F h\right|_F \left|\beta'(s)\right|_F = \left|\alpha'(s)\right|.$$

Lorentzian space form	**Decomposition of the fibre**	**Totally geodesic lightlike hypersurface**
$\mathbb{R}^n_1 = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$	$\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$	$\left\{(s, s, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}\right\}$
$\mathbb{S}^n_1 = \mathbb{R} \times_{\cosh(t)} \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$	$\left(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right) \times_{\cos(s)} \mathbb{S}^{n-2}$	$\Big\{ \left(2 \arg\tanh\left(\tan\left(\frac{s}{2}\right)\right), s, z\right) \in \mathbb{R} \times \left(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right) \times \mathbb{S}^{n-2}\Big\}$
A portion of $\mathbb{H}^n_1 = \left(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right) \times_{\cos(t)} \mathbb{H}^{n-1}$	$\mathbb{R} \times_{\cosh(s)} \mathbb{H}^{n-2}$	$\Big\{ \left(2 \arg\tan\left(\tanh\left(\frac{s}{2}\right)\right), s, z\right) \in \left(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right) \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}^{n-2}\Big\}$

Table 2: Totally geodesic lightlike hypersurfaces in space forms.

RW space	**Decomposition of the fibre**
$I \times_f \mathbb{R}^n$	$(0, \infty) \times_s \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$
$I \times_f \mathbb{S}^n$	$(0, \pi) \times_{\sin(s)} \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$
$I \times_f \mathbb{H}^n$	$(0, \infty) \times_{\sinh(s)} \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$

Table 3: Decomposition of the fibre induced by a lightcone.

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and that locally $C^{\pm}_{p_*} = \exp_{p_*}(\widehat{C}^{\pm}_{p_*})$, L is contained in the lightcone at p_* if and only if $\nabla^F h$ and β' are proportional and $\lim_{x \to x_*} h(x) = t_*$, but observe that β' is proportional to P^F. $\Box$

Remark 41 *Take L a lightlike hypersurface given by the graph of a function h. Given $p_* \in L$ and any lightlike geodesic $\gamma(s) = (\alpha(s), \beta(s))$ with $\gamma(0) = p_*$, if follows $h(\beta(s)) \leq \alpha(s)$ and the equality holds if and only if γ belongs to L. This implies that, in a neighborhood of a point $q \in L$ near p_*, $L \subset I^+(p_*)^c$. Geometrically, this means that the local lightcone at p_* is an extremal lightlike hypersurface near p_*. This result is also true for any arbitrary Lorentzian manifold. Indeed, given a point $p_* \in L$ consider Θ a normal neighborhood of p_* and suppose there exists a point $q \in L \cap I^+(p_*, \Theta)$. Take a timelike plane $\Pi \subset T_{p_*}M$ with $0, \widehat{q} \in \Pi$, where $\widehat{q} = \exp^{-1}_{p_*}(q)$. The intersection $L \cap \exp_{p_*}(\Pi)$ is the trace of a curve from p_* to q such that in each of its points is lightlike or spacelike and is contained in the timelike surface $\exp_{p_*}(\Pi)$, but $q \in I^+(p_*, \exp_{p_*}(\Pi))$, which is a contradiction.*

Lemma 42 *Let $M = I \times_f F$ be a GRW space with F complete and take $(t_0, x_0) \in M$ such that F decomposes in a neighborhood of x_0 as a twisted product*

$$\left((a,b) \times S, ds^2 + \mu(s,z)^2 g_S\right),$$

where $-\infty < a < b \leq \infty$ ($-\infty \leq a < b < \infty$), S is connected and x_0 is identified with $(0, z_0)$ for some $z_0 \in S$. Let $c(t) = \int_{t_0}^{t} \frac{1}{f(r)} dr$ and L the lightlike hypersurface given by $\{(c^{-1}(s), s, z) \in I \times (a,b) \times S\}$. Then L is contained in a future (past) local lightcone of M if and only if

1. $\lim_{s \to a^+} \mu(s,z) = 0$ *for all* $z \in S$ ($\lim_{s \to b^-} \mu(s,z) = 0$ *for all* $z \in S$).
2. *It exists* $t_* \in I$ *with* $\int_{t_0}^{t_*} \frac{1}{f(r)} dr = a$ $\left(\int_{t_0}^{t_*} \frac{1}{f(r)} dr = b\right)$.

Proof. Suppose that (1) and (2) hold. Since the integral curves of ∂_s are unitary geodesics and F is complete, it exists $\lim_{s \to a^+}(s,z)$ for all $z \in S$. Fix $z, z' \in S$ two distinct points such that there exists $\sigma(r)$ a unitary geodesic in S with $\sigma(0) = z$ and $\sigma(d) = z'$. If we call $\gamma_s(r) = (s, \sigma(r))$, then $d_F(\gamma_s(0), \gamma_s(d)) \leq length(\gamma_s) = \int_0^d \mu(s, \sigma(r)) dr$ and so $lim_{s \to a^+} d_F(\gamma_s(0), \gamma_s(d)) = 0$. Therefore, since S is connected, $\lim_{s \to a^+}(s,z)$ is the same for all $z \in S$, say $x_* \in F$, and the integral curves of ∂_s are radial geodesic from x_*. Thus, $d_F(x_*, (s,z)) = s - a$ and given $(t,x) \in L$ we have $d_F(x_*, x) = \int_{t_0}^{t} \frac{1}{f(r)} dr - a = \int_{t_*}^{t} \frac{1}{f(r)} dr$. By Proposition 33, L is contained in the lightcone $C^+_{(t_*, x_*)}$. The converse is straightforward. $\Box$

Theorem 43 *Let $M = I \times_f \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ ($n > 3$) be a RW space such that*

$$\pi < \int_I \frac{1}{f(r)} dr. \tag{16}$$

Then any totally umbilic lightlike hypersurface is an open set of a lightcone. In particular, it can not exists totally geodesic lightlike hypersurfaces.

Proof. Let L be a totally umbilic lightlike hypersurface and take $(t_0, x_0) \in L$. Using Theorem 39, $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ can be decomposed in a neighborhood of x_0 as a twisted product. Since $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ is Einstein, this decomposition is actually a warped product [7], then it is easy to show that it is

$$\left(-\frac{\pi}{2} - \theta, \frac{\pi}{2} - \theta\right) \times_\mu \mathbb{S}^{n-2}(|\cos(\theta)|),$$

where $\theta \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})$, $\mu(s) = \frac{\cos(s+\theta)}{\cos(\theta)}$ and x_0 is identified with $(0, z_0)$ for some $z_0 \in \mathbb{S}^{n-2}$.

Using (16), it exists $t_* \in I$ such that $\int_{t_0}^{t_*} \frac{1}{f(r)} dr = \frac{\pi}{2} - \theta$ or $\int_{t_0}^{t_*} \frac{1}{f(r)} dr = -\frac{\pi}{2} - \theta$ and applying the above lemma, L is contained in a lightcone. The last claim follows from Proposition 28. $\Box$

If condition (16) does not hold, then the conclusion of the theorem is not true. For example, in $\mathbb{S}^n_1 = \mathbb{R} \times_{\cosh(t)} \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ there are totally geodesic lightlike hypersurfaces.

On the other hand, if the fibre is not $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ then it can also exists totally umbilic lightlike hypersurfaces which are not a lightcone although condition (16) holds. Indeed, take $f \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$ a positive function such that $\pi < \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{f(r)} dr$ and let M be the RW space $\mathbb{R} \times_f \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Then, using Proposition 33 and Theorem 39, it is easy to see that

$$\left\{ \left(c^{-1}(s), s, x_2, \ldots, x_{n-2} \right) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \right\},$$

where $c(t) = \int_0^t \frac{1}{f(r)} dr$, is a totally umbilic lightlike hypersurface which is not a lightcone.

Example 44 *Applying Theorem 43, lightcones are the unique totally umbilic lightlike hypersurfaces in the closed Friedmann Cosmological model, since in this case* $\int_I \frac{1}{f} = 2\pi$. *Recall that we already knew that Friedmann models can not possess totally geodesic lightlike hypersurfaces from Proposition 1.*

In [1] it is shown that totally umbilic lightlike hypersurfaces in a Lorentzian manifold of constant curvature are contained in lightcones. The proof is based on their following claim: in a Lorentzian manifold any totally umbilic lightlike hypersurfaces with zero lightlike sectional curvature is contained in a lightcone. However, the example below shows that this is not true in general.

Example 45 *Let* $Q \times_r \mathbb{S}^2$ *be the Kruskal spacetime, [14]. The hypersurface* $L_{u_0} = \{(u_0, v, x) : (u_0, v) \in Q,\ x \in \mathbb{S}^2\}$ *is totally umbilic and lightlike. Moreover, if* Π *is a lightlike tangent plane to* L_{u_0}*, then it is spanned by* ∂_v *and* $w \in T\mathbb{S}^2$*, so*

$$\mathcal{K}_{\partial_v}(\Pi) = -\frac{Hess_r(\partial_v, \partial_v)}{r} = 0,$$

but L_{u_0} *is not a lightcone.*

We prove now that totally umbilic lightlike hypersurfaces in Lorentzian manifolds of constant curvature are contained in lightcones using techniques developed in this paper.

Theorem 46 *Any totally umbilic lightlike hypersurface in a complete space of constant curvature and dimension greater than three is totally geodesic or is contained in a lightcone.*

Proof. We can suppose that M is $\mathbb{R}^n_1$, $\mathbb{S}^n_1$ or $\mathbb{H}^n_1$. Take L a totally umbilic and non totally geodesic lightlike hypersurface in $\mathbb{R}^n_1 = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. From Theorem 39 and [7], it induces a decomposition of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, but since L is not totally geodesic, the only possible decomposition is $\left(-\frac{1}{\theta}, \infty\right) \times_{\theta s+1} \mathbb{S}^{n-2}\left(\frac{1}{\theta}\right)$ for $\theta > 0$ or $\left(-\infty, -\frac{1}{\theta}\right) \times_{\theta s+1} \mathbb{S}^{n-2}\left(-\frac{1}{\theta}\right)$ for $\theta < 0$. Applying Lemma 42, L is a lightcone. Suppose now that $M = \mathbb{S}^n_1 = \mathbb{R} \times_{\cosh(t)} \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Without loss of generality, we can suppose that $(0, x_0) \in L$ for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. As in the proof of Theorem 43, there is a decomposition of $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ as

$$\left(-\frac{\pi}{2} - \theta, \frac{\pi}{2} - \theta\right) \times_{\mu} \mathbb{S}^{n-2}(|\cos(\theta)|),$$

where $\theta \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})$ and $\mu(s) = \frac{\cos(s+\theta)}{\cos(\theta)}$. If $\theta = 0$, then L is totally geodesic (see Table 2). If $\theta \neq 0$, using Lemma 42, L is contained in a lightcone.

Finally, we consider $M = \mathbb{H}^n_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_2$. Since it does not admit a global decomposition as a RW space, a little more work must be done in this case. We can suppose that L intersects an open set of $\mathbb{H}^n_1$ isometric to $\left(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right) \times_{\cos t} \mathbb{H}^{n-1}$ and $(0, x_0) \in L$ for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{H}^{n-1}$. Applying Theorem 39 and [7], there is a decomposition of $\mathbb{H}^{n-1}$ as a warped product $J \times_\mu S$ in a neighborhood of x_0 and L is given by $\{\left(2 \arg\tan\left(\tanh \frac{s}{2}\right), s, z\right) : s \in J, z \in S\}$. The decomposition of $\mathbb{H}^{n-1}$ can be of three different types.

- $J \times_{\frac{\sinh(s+\theta)}{\sinh\theta}} \mathbb{S}^{n-2}\left(|\sinh\theta|\right)$ where $J = (-\theta, \infty)$ if $\theta > 0$ and $J = (-\infty, -\theta)$ if $\theta < 0$. In this case we can apply Lemma 42.
- $\mathbb{R} \times_{\frac{\cosh(s+\theta)}{\cosh\theta}} \mathbb{H}^{n-2}(\cosh\theta)$ where $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. If $\theta = 0$, then L is totally geodesic (see Table 2), so we suppose $\theta \neq 0$. The map

  $$\Phi : \left(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right) \times_{\cos t} \left(\mathbb{R} \times_{\frac{\cosh(s+\theta)}{\cosh\theta}} \mathbb{H}^{n-2}(\cosh\theta)\right) \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_2$$

  given by $\Phi(t, s, z) = \left(\cos t \sinh(s+\theta), \frac{\cos t \cosh(s+\theta)}{\cosh\theta} z, \sin t\right)$ is an isometric embedding into $\mathbb{H}^n_1$. If we call $t = 2 \arg\tan\left(\tanh \frac{s}{2}\right)$, then it holds $\cos t \cosh s = 1$ and $\sin t = \tanh s$ and it is easy to show that

  $$\begin{aligned}&\Phi(L) = \\ &\left\{(\sinh\theta + \cosh\theta \tanh s, (1 + \tanh\theta \tanh s) z, \tanh s) : s \in \mathbb{R}, z \in \mathbb{H}^{n-2}\right\}\end{aligned}$$

  is contained in the lightcone of $\mathbb{H}^n_1$ at $\left(-\frac{1}{\sinh\theta}, 0, \dots, 0, -\frac{1}{\tanh\theta}\right)$.
- $\mathbb{R} \times_{e^s} \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$. The map

  $$\Psi : \left(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right) \times_{\cos t} \left(\mathbb{R} \times_{e^s} \mathbb{R}^{n-2}\right) \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_2$$

  given by

  $$\begin{aligned}&\Psi(t, s, z) \\ &= \left(e^s \cos t \cdot z, \frac{\cos t \left(e^s\left(1 - |z|^2\right) - e^{-s}\right)}{2}, \frac{\cos t\left(e^s\left(1 + |z|^2\right) + e^{-s}\right)}{2}, \sin t\right)\end{aligned}$$

  is an isometric embedding. As before, we have

  $$\begin{aligned}&\Psi(L) \\ &= \left\{\left(\frac{e^s \cdot z}{\cosh s}, \tanh s - \frac{e^s |z|^2}{2\cosh s}, 1 + \frac{e^s |z|^2}{2\cosh s}, \tanh s\right) : s \in \mathbb{R}, z \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}\right\},\end{aligned}$$

  which is contained in the lightcone of $\mathbb{H}^n_1$ at $(0, \dots, 0, -1, 1, -1)$.

□

References

[1] M.A. Akivis and V.V. Goldberg, On some methods of construction of invariant normalizations of lightlike hypersurfaces, Differential Geom. Appl. **12** (2000), 121-143.

[2] A. Ashtekar, C. Beetle and S. Fairhurst, Isolated horizons: a generalization of black hole mechanics, Classical Quantum Gravity. **16** (1999), L1-L7.

[3] A. Ashtekar, C. Beetle and S. Fairhurst, Mechanics of isolated horizons, Classical Quantum Gravity. **17** (2000), 253-298.

[4] C. Atindogbe, J.P. Ezin and J. Tossa, Pseudo-inversion of degenerate metrics, Int. J. Math. Math. Sci. **55** (2003), 3479-3501.

[5] K.L. Duggal and A. Bejancu, *Lightlike submanifolds of semi-Riemannian manifolds and applications*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1996.

[6] K.L. Duggal and A. Gimenez, Lightlike hypersurfaces of Lorentzian manifolds with distinguished screen distribution, J. Geom. Phys. **55** (2005), 107-122.

[7] M. Fernández-López, E. García-Río, D.N. Kupeli and B. Unal, A curvature condition for a twisted product to be a warped product, Manuscripta Math. **106** (2001), 213-217.

[8] J.L. Flores and M. Sánchez, Geodesic connectedness and conjugate points in GRW space-times, J. Geom. Phys. **36** (2000) 285-314.

[9] G.J. Galloway, Maximum Principles for Null Hypersurfaces and Null Splitting Theorems, Ann. Henri Poincaré **1** (2000), 543-567.

[10] E. Gourgoulhon and J. L. Jaramillo, A $3 + 1$ perspective on null hypersurfaces and isolated horizons, Phys. Rep. **423** (2006), 159-294.

[11] M. Gutiérrez and B. Olea, Global decomposition of a Lorentzian manifold as a generalized Robertson-Walker space, Differential Geom. Appl. **27** (2009), 146-156.

[12] M. Gutiérrez, F.J. Palomo and A. Romero, A Berger-Green type inequality for compact Lorentzian manifolds, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **354** (2002), 4505-4523.

[13] D. Kupeli, On null submanifolds in spacetimes, Geom. Dedicata **23** (1987), 33-51.

[14] B. O'Neill, *Semi-Riemannian geometry with Application to Relativity*, Academic Press, 1983.

[15] M. Sánchez, On the geometry of generalized Robertson-Walker spacetimes: geodesics, Gen. Relativity Gravitation. **6** (1998), 915-932.

[16] J.A. Schouten, *Ricci-Calculus*, Springer Verlag, 1954.